

The maximal length of a gap between r -graph Turán densities

Oleg Pikhurko*

Mathematics Institute and DIMAP
University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

August 10, 2021

Abstract

The *Turán density* $\pi(\mathcal{F})$ of a family \mathcal{F} of r -graphs is the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ of the maximum edge density of an \mathcal{F} -free r -graph on n vertices. Erdős [Israel J. Math **2** (1964) 183–190] proved that no Turán density can lie in the open interval $(0, r!/r^r)$. Here we show that any other open subinterval of $[0, 1]$ avoiding Turán densities has strictly smaller length. In particular, this implies a conjecture of Grosu [E-print arXiv:1403.4653v1, 2014].

1 Introduction

Let \mathcal{F} be a (possibly infinite) family of r -graphs (that is, r -uniform set systems). We call elements of \mathcal{F} *forbidden*. An r -graph G is \mathcal{F} -free if no member $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is a subgraph of G , that is, we cannot obtain F by deleting some vertices and edges from G . The *Turán function* $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{F})$ is the maximum number of edges that an \mathcal{F} -free r -graph on n vertices can have. This is one of the central questions of extremal combinatorics that goes back to the fundamental paper of Turán [15]. We refer the reader to the surveys of the Turán function by Füredi [8], Keevash [12], and Sidorenko [14].

As it was observed by Katona, Nemetz, and Simonovits [11], the limit

$$\pi(\mathcal{F}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{F})}{\binom{n}{r}}$$

exists. It is called the *Turán density* of \mathcal{F} . Let $\Pi_\infty^{(r)}$ consist of all possible Turán densities of r -graph families and let $\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)}$ be the set of all possible Turán densities when *finitely many* r -graphs are forbidden. It is convenient to allow empty forbidden families, so that 1 is also a Turán density. Clearly, $\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)} \subseteq \Pi_\infty^{(r)}$. A result of Brown and Simonovits [3, Theorem 1] implies that the topological closure $\text{cl}(\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)})$ of $\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)}$ contains $\Pi_\infty^{(r)}$ while the converse inclusion was

*Supported by ERC grant 306493 and EPSRC grant EP/K012045/1.

established in [13, Proposition 1]; thus

$$\Pi_{\infty}^{(r)} = \text{cl}(\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)}), \quad \text{for every integer } r \geq 2. \quad (1)$$

For $r = 2$, the celebrated Erdős-Stone-Simonovits Theorem [5, 6] determines the Turán density for every family \mathcal{F} . In particular, we have

$$\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(2)} = \Pi_{\infty}^{(2)} = \left\{ \frac{m-1}{m} : m = 1, 2, 3, \dots, \infty \right\}. \quad (2)$$

Unfortunately, the Turán function for *hypergraphs* (that is, r -graphs with $r \geq 3$) is much more difficult to analyse and many problems (even rather basic ones) are wide open.

Fix some $r \geq 2$. A *gap* is an open interval $(a, b) \subseteq (0, 1)$ that is disjoint from $\Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ (which, by (1), is equivalent to being disjoint from $\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)}$). Here we consider g_r , the maximal possible length of a gap. In other words, g_r is the maximal g such that there is a real a with $(a, a+g) \subseteq (0, 1) \setminus \Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$. For example, (2) implies that $g_2 = 1/2$. Erdős [4] proved that $(0, r!/r^r)$ is a gap; in particular, $g_r \geq r!/r^r$. Here we show that this is equality and every other gap has strictly smaller length.

Theorem 1 *For every $r \geq 3$, we have that $g_r = r!/r^r$ and, furthermore, $(0, r!/r^r)$ is the only gap of length $r!/r^r$ for r -graphs.*

In particular we obtain the following result that was conjectured by Grosu [9, Conjecture 10].

Corollary 2 *The union of r -graph Turán densities over all $r \geq 2$ is dense in $[0, 1]$, that is, $\text{cl}(\cup_{r=2}^{\infty} \Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}) = [0, 1]$. ■*

The question whether the set $\Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ is a well-ordered subset of $([0, 1], <)$ for $r \geq 3$ was a famous \$1000 problem of Erdős that was answered in the negative by Frankl and Rödl [7]. Despite a number of results that followed [7], very little is known about other gaps in $\Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ for $r \geq 3$. For example, let g'_r be the the second largest gap length, that is, the maximum $g \geq 0$ such that $(a, a+g) \subseteq (r!/r^r, 1) \setminus \Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ for some a . The computer-generated proof of Baber and Talbot [2] implies that $g'_3 \geq 0.0017$. However, not for a single $r \geq 4$ is it known, for example, whether g'_r is zero (i.e. whether $\Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ is dense in $[r!/r^r, 1]$).

This paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we give some definitions and auxiliary results. Theorem 1 is proved in Section 3. We give another proof of Corollary 2 in Section 4. Although the latter proof is not strong enough to prove Theorem 1, its advantage is that it produces explicit elements of $\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)}$ (as opposed to the implicit values of certain maximisation problems returned by the proof in Section 3). So we include both proofs here, even though the second one is longer.

2 Preliminaries

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. For reals $a \leq b$, let (a, b) and $[a, b]$ be respectively open and closed intervals of reals with endpoints a and b . The *standard* $(m - 1)$ -dimensional simplex is

$$\mathbb{S}_m := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m : x_1 + \dots + x_m = 1, \forall i \in [m] x_i \geq 0\}.$$

An r -*pattern* is a collection P of r -multisets on $[m]$, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. (By an r -*multiset* we mean an unordered collection of r elements with repetitions allowed.) Let V_1, \dots, V_m be disjoint sets and let $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m$. The *profile* of an r -set $X \subseteq V$ (with respect to V_1, \dots, V_m) is the r -multiset on $[m]$ that contains $i \in [m]$ with multiplicity $|X \cap V_i|$. For an r -multiset Y on $[m]$, let $Y((V_1, \dots, V_m))$ consist of all r -subsets of V whose profile is Y . We call this r -graph the *blow-up* of Y (with respect to V_1, \dots, V_m) and the r -graph

$$P((V_1, \dots, V_m)) := \bigcup_{Y \in P} Y((V_1, \dots, V_m))$$

is called the *blow-up* of P . Let the *Lagrange polynomial* of P be

$$\lambda_P(x_1, \dots, x_m) := r! \sum_{D \in P} \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{x_i^{D(i)}}{D(i)!} \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_m],$$

where $D(i)$ denotes the multiplicity of i in D . This definition is motivated by the fact that, for every partition $[n] = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m$, we have that

$$|P((V_1, \dots, V_m))| = \lambda_P\left(\frac{|V_1|}{n}, \dots, \frac{|V_m|}{n}\right) \times \binom{n}{r} + O(n^{r-1}), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For example, if $r = 3$, $m = 3$, and P consists of multisets $\{1, 1, 2\}$ and $\{1, 2, 3\}$, then $P((V_1, \dots, V_m))$ contains all triples that have two vertices in V_1 and one vertex in V_2 plus all triples with exactly one vertex in each part; here $\lambda_P(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 3x_1^2x_2 + 6x_1x_2x_3$.

Let the *Lagrangian* of P be $\Lambda_P := \max\{\lambda_P(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_m\}$, the maximum value of the polynomial λ_P on the compact set \mathbb{S}_m . One obvious connection of this parameter to r -graph Turán densities is that, if each blow-up of P is \mathcal{F} -free, then $\pi(\mathcal{F}) \geq \Lambda_P$. Also, it is not hard to show that $\Lambda_P = \pi(\mathcal{F})$, where \mathcal{F} consists of all r -graphs F such that every blow-up of P is F -free; thus $\Lambda_P \in \Pi_\infty^{(r)}$. As shown in [13, Theorem 3], we have in fact that

$$\Lambda_P \in \Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)}, \quad \text{for every } r\text{-pattern } P. \quad (3)$$

We will use a special case of Muirhead's inequality (see e.g. [10, Theorem 45]) which states that, for any $0 \leq i < j \leq k$, we have

$$x^{k+i}y^{k-i} + x^{k-i}y^{k+i} \leq x^{k+j}y^{k-j} + x^{k-j}y^{k+j}, \quad \text{for } x, y \geq 0. \quad (4)$$

3 Proof of Theorem 1

Let $r \geq 3$. Fix a sufficiently large integer $m = m(r)$ so that $r! \binom{m}{r} / m^r > 1 - r! / r^r$. Consider r -graphs $G_0, \dots, G_{\binom{m}{r}}$ on $[m]$ such that G_0 has no edges and, for $i = 1, \dots, \binom{m}{r}$, the r -graph

G_i is obtained from G_{i-1} by adding a new edge. In other words, we enumerate all r -subsets of $[m]$ as $R_1, \dots, R_{\binom{m}{r}}$ and let $G_i := \{R_1, \dots, R_i\}$. Let

$$\lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) := \lambda_{G_i}(\mathbf{x}) = r! \sum_{D \in G_i} \prod_{j \in D} x_j,$$

be the Lagrange polynomial of G_i and $\Lambda_i := \Lambda_{G_i}$ be its Lagrangian, where we view G_i as an r -pattern. Since $G_{i-1} \subseteq G_i$, we have that $\Lambda_{i-1} \leq \Lambda_i$.

We claim that for every $i \in [\binom{m}{r}]$

$$\Lambda_i - \Lambda_{i-1} \leq r!/r^r. \quad (5)$$

Indeed, pick $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_m$ with $\Lambda_i = \lambda_i(\mathbf{x})$. Let $R_i = \{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$. When we remove the term $r! x_{u_1} \dots x_{u_r}$ from $\lambda_i(\mathbf{x})$, we get the evaluation of λ_{i-1} on $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_m$. By definition, $\Lambda_{i-1} \geq \lambda_{i-1}(\mathbf{x})$. Also, since $x_{u_1} + \dots + x_{u_r} \leq 1$, we have $x_{u_1} \dots x_{u_r} \leq r^{-r}$ by the Geometric-Arithmetic Mean Inequality. Thus we obtain the stated bound:

$$\Lambda_i = \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}) + r! x_{u_1} \dots x_{u_r} \leq \Lambda_{i-1} + r!/r^r.$$

Also, we have $\Lambda_{\binom{m}{r}} \geq \lambda_{\binom{m}{r}}(\frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{1}{m}) = r! \binom{m}{r} / m^r > 1 - r!/r^r$. This and (3) imply that $g_r \leq r!/r^r$, while the result of Erdős [4] gives the converse inequality. Also, if we have equality in (5), then necessarily $x_{u_1} = \dots = x_{u_r} = 1/r$ and thus $\Lambda_{i-1} = 0$, implying the uniqueness part of Theorem 1.

4 Alternative proof of Corollary 2

For integers $r, s \geq 2$, let $\mathcal{P}_{r,s}$ consist of ordered s -tuples (r_1, \dots, r_s) of non-negative integers such that $r_1 \geq \dots \geq r_s$ and $r_1 + \dots + r_s = r$. This set admits a partial order, where $\mathbf{x} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{y}$ if $\sum_{i=1}^k x_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^k y_i$ for every $k \in [s]$. For example, the (unique) maximal element is $(r, 0, \dots, 0)$ and the (unique) minimal element is $(\lceil r/s \rceil, \dots, \lfloor r/s \rfloor)$.

Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{r,s}$. The set A is called *down-closed* if $\mathbf{y} \in A$ whenever $\mathbf{x} \in A$ and $\mathbf{x} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{y}$. Let G_A consist of all r -multisets X on $[s]$ such that the multiplicities of X satisfy $\langle X(1), \dots, X(s) \rangle \in A$, where $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ denotes the non-increasing ordering of a vector \mathbf{x} . Also, we use shortcuts $\lambda_A := \lambda_{G_A}$ and $\Lambda_A := \Lambda_{G_A}$.

Lemma 3 *Let $r, s \geq 2$. If $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{r,s}$ is down-closed, then $\Lambda_A = \lambda_A(\frac{1}{s}, \dots, \frac{1}{s})$.*

Proof. We use induction on s .

First, we prove the base case $s = 2$. Let $k := r/2$. For $h \geq 0$, let I_h consist of all integer translates of k whose absolute value is at most h , that is, $I_h := (\mathbb{Z} + k) \cap [-h, h]$. Also, let $I_h^+ := I_h \cap [0, h]$. (These definitions will allow us to deal with the cases of even and odd r uniformly.) For example, $\mathcal{P}_{r,2} = \{(k+i, k-i) : i \in I_k^+\}$.

Take a down-closed set $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{r,2}$. It consists of pairs $(k+i, k-i)$ with $i \in I_h^+$ for some h . By the homogeneity of the polynomials involved, the required inequality can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i \in I_h} \binom{2k}{k+i} \left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)^{2k} - \sum_{i \in I_h} \binom{2k}{k+i} x^{k+i} y^{k-i} \geq 0, \quad \text{for } x, y \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

We will apply the so-called *bunching method* where we try to write the desired inequality as a positive linear combination of Muirhead's inequalities (4). If $j \in I_h$, then the coefficient in front of $x^{k+j} y^{k-j}$ in (6) is

$$2^{-2k} \binom{2k}{k+j} \sum_{i \in I_h} \binom{2k}{k+i} - \binom{2k}{k+j} \leq 0.$$

If $j \in I_k \setminus I_h$, then the coefficient is $2^{-2k} \binom{2k}{k+j} \sum_{i \in I_h} \binom{2k}{k+i} \geq 0$. Thus, if we group (6) into terms $x^{k+j} y^{k-j} + x^{k-j} y^{k+j}$, then we get non-positive coefficients for $0 \leq j \leq h$ followed by non-negative coefficients for $j > h$. Also, the total sum of coefficients is zero because (6) becomes equality for $x = y = 1$. Thus we can "bunch" I_h -terms with $(I_k \setminus I_h)$ -terms and use (4) to derive the desired inequality (6). This proves the case $s = 2$.

Now, let $s \geq 3$ and suppose that we have proved the lemma for $s-1$ (and all r). The function λ_A is a continuous function on the compact set \mathbb{S}_s . Let it attain its maximum on some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_s$. If there is more than one choice, then choose \mathbf{x} so that $\Delta := \sum_{i \neq j} |x_i - x_j|$ is minimised. Suppose that $\Delta \neq 0$, say $x_1 \neq x_2$. Note that λ_A is a homogeneous polynomial of degree r , and the coefficient at $x_1^{r_1} \dots x_s^{r_s}$ is $\binom{r}{r_1, \dots, r_s}$ if the ordering $\langle \mathbf{r} \rangle$ of \mathbf{r} is in A and 0 otherwise.

Fix $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. If we collect all terms in front of x_s^j , we get

$$\sum_{\substack{\langle \mathbf{r}, j \rangle \in A \\ r_1 + \dots + r_{s-1} = r-j}} \binom{r}{r_1, \dots, r_{s-1}, j} \prod_{i=1}^{s-1} x_i^{r_i} = \binom{r}{j} \lambda_{A \setminus j}(x_1, \dots, x_{s-1}),$$

where $\langle \mathbf{y}, j \rangle$ is obtained from \mathbf{y} by inserting j and ordering the obtained sequence, while $A \setminus j$ consists of those $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{P}_{r-j, s-1}$ such that $\langle \mathbf{y}, j \rangle \in A$.

Let us show that $A \setminus j \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{r-j, s-1}$ is down-closed. Take arbitrary $\mathbf{z} \in A \setminus j$ and $\mathbf{y} \preceq \mathbf{z}$. We have to show that $\mathbf{y} \in A \setminus j$. Since $A \ni \langle \mathbf{z}, j \rangle$ is down-closed, it is enough to show that $\langle \mathbf{z}, j \rangle \succ \langle \mathbf{y}, j \rangle$. We have to compare the sums of the first i terms of $\langle \mathbf{z}, j \rangle$ and of $\langle \mathbf{y}, j \rangle$. A problem could arise only if the new entry j was included into these terms for $\langle \mathbf{y}, j \rangle$, say as the term number $h \leq i$, but not for $\langle \mathbf{z}, j \rangle$. Since $\mathbf{z} \succ \mathbf{y}$, we have that $\sum_{f=1}^{h-1} z_f \geq \sum_{f=1}^{h-1} y_f$ (and these are also the initial sums for $\langle \mathbf{z}, j \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{y}, j \rangle$). Furthermore, each of the subsequent $i - (h-1)$ entries is at least j for $\langle \mathbf{z}, j \rangle$ and at most j for $\langle \mathbf{y}, j \rangle$. It follows that $\langle \mathbf{z}, j \rangle \succ \langle \mathbf{y}, j \rangle$. Thus $A \setminus j$ is down-closed, as claimed.

By the induction assumption (and since $\lambda_{A \setminus j}$ is a homogeneous polynomial), we have that $\lambda_{A \setminus j}(x_1, \dots, x_{s-1}) \leq \lambda_{A \setminus j}\left(\frac{1-x_s}{s-1}, \dots, \frac{1-x_s}{s-1}\right)$. Thus

$$\lambda_A = \lambda_A(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=0}^r \binom{r}{j} \lambda_{A \setminus j}(x_1, \dots, x_{s-1}) x_s^j \leq \lambda_A\left(\frac{1-x_s}{s-1}, \dots, \frac{1-x_s}{s-1}, x_s\right).$$

Clearly, the sum $\sum_{i=1}^{s-1} |x_s - x_i|$ does not increase if we replace each of x_1, \dots, x_{s-1} by their arithmetic mean $(1 - x_s)/(s - 1)$. Since $x_1 \neq x_2$, we have found another optimal element of \mathbb{S}_s with strictly smaller Δ , a contradiction. The lemma is proved. ■

Fix some enumeration $\mathcal{P}_{r,r} = \{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$ such that if $R_i \succ R_j$ then $i \geq j$. For $j \in \{0, \dots, m\}$, let $A_j := \{R_i : i \in [j]\}$. Thus, for example, $A_0 = \emptyset$ and $A_m = \mathcal{P}_{r,r}$. By (3), $\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)}$ contains all of the following numbers:

$$0 = \Lambda_{A_0} \leq \Lambda_{A_1} \leq \dots \leq \Lambda_{A_m} = 1.$$

Let us show that $\max\{\Lambda_{A_i} - \Lambda_{A_{i-1}} : i \in [m]\} = o(1)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. By definition, each $A_j \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{r,r}$ is down-closed. Thus, by Lemma 3 the difference $\Lambda_{A_i} - \Lambda_{A_{i-1}}$ is the probability that, when r balls are uniformly and independently distributed into r urns, the ordered ball distribution is given by R_i . Expose the first $r - m$ balls, where, for example, $m := \lfloor \log r \rfloor$. Let k be the number of empty cells. Its expected value is $r(1 - 1/r)^{r-m} = (e^{-1} + o(1))r$. By Azuma's inequality (see e.g. [1, Theorem 7.2.1]), we have *whp* (i.e. with probability $1 - o(1)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$) that k is in $I := [r/4, 3r/4]$. Assume that $k \in I$ and expose the remaining m balls. Let J be the number of balls that land inside the k cells that were empty after the first round. The probability that $J = j$ for any particular $j \in [m/8, 7m/8]$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{m}{j} \left(\frac{k}{r}\right)^j \left(\frac{r-k}{r}\right)^{m-j} &= (1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi j(m-j)}} \left(\frac{mk}{jr}\right)^j \left(\frac{m(r-k)}{(m-j)r}\right)^{m-j} \\ &\leq (1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi j(m-j)}} = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Stirling's formula and the Arithmetic-Geometric Mean Inequality. On the other hand, we have *whp* that $m/8 \leq J \leq 7m/8$ (by Azuma's inequality and our assumption $k \in I$) and that the last m balls all go into different cells (since $m^2 = o(r)$). Thus the probability of getting R_i as the final ball distribution is $o(1)$ uniformly in i , as desired. This finishes the second proof of Corollary 2.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Codrut Grosu for helpful comments.

References

- [1] N. Alon and J. Spencer, *The probabilistic method*, 3d ed., Wiley Interscience, 2008.
- [2] R. Baber and J. Talbot, *Hypergraphs do jump*, *Combin. Probab. Computing* **20** (2011), 161–171.
- [3] W. G. Brown and M. Simonovits, *Digraph extremal problems, hypergraph extremal problems and the densities of graph structures*, *Discrete Math.* **48** (1984), 147–162.

- [4] P. Erdős, *On extremal problems of graphs and generalized graphs*, Israel J. Math. **2** (1964), 183–190.
- [5] P. Erdős and M. Simonovits, *A limit theorem in graph theory*, Stud. Sci. Math. Hungar. (1966), 51–57.
- [6] P. Erdős and A. H. Stone, *On the structure of linear graphs*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **52** (1946), 1087–1091.
- [7] P. Frankl and V. Rödl, *Hypergraphs do not jump*, Combinatorica **4** (1984), 149–159.
- [8] Z. Füredi, *Turán type problems*, Surveys in Combinatorics (A. D. Keedwell, ed.), London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Ser., vol. 166, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991, pp. 253–300.
- [9] C. Grosu, *On the algebraic and topological structure of the set of Turán densities*, E-print [arXiv:1403.4653v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.4653v1), 2014.
- [10] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1952, 2d ed.
- [11] G. O. H. Katona, T. Nemetz, and M. Simonovits, *On a graph problem of Turán (In Hungarian)*, Mat. Fiz. Lapok **15** (1964), 228–238.
- [12] P. Keevash, *Hypergraph Turán problem*, Surveys in Combinatorics (R. Chapman, ed.), London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Ser., vol. 392, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011, pp. 83–140.
- [13] O. Pikhurko, *Possible Turán densities*, Israel J. Math. **201** (2014), 415–454.
- [14] A. Sidorenko, *What we know and what we do not know about Turán numbers*, Graphs Combin. **11** (1995), 179–199.
- [15] P. Turán, *On an extremal problem in graph theory (in Hungarian)*, Mat. Fiz. Lapok **48** (1941), 436–452.