

Triangles in C_5 -free graphs and Hypergraphs of Girth Six

Beka Ergemlidze ^{*} Abhishek Methuku [†]

November 30, 2018

Abstract

We introduce a new approach and prove that the maximum number of triangles in a C_5 -free graph on n vertices is at most

$$(1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}} n^{3/2}.$$

We also show a connection to r -uniform hypergraphs without (Berge) cycles of length less than six, and estimate their maximum possible size.

1 Introduction

Motivated by a conjecture of Erdős [3] on the maximum possible number of pentagons in a triangle-free graph, Bollobás and Gyóri [2] initiated the study of the natural converse of this problem. Let $ex(n, K_3, C_5)$ denote the maximum possible number of triangles in a graph on n vertices without containing a cycle of length five as a subgraph. Bollobás and Gyóri [2] showed that

$$(1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}} n^{3/2} \leq ex(n, K_3, C_5) \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{5}{4} n^{3/2}. \quad (1)$$

Their lower bound comes from the following example: Take a C_4 -free bipartite graph G_0 on $n/3 + n/3$ vertices with about $(n/3)^{3/2}$ edges and double each vertex in one of the color classes and add an edge joining the old and the new copy to produce a graph G . Then, it is easy to check that G contains no C_5 and it has $(n/3)^{3/2}$ triangles.

^{*}Department of Mathematics, Central European University, Budapest. E-mail: beka.ergemlidze@gmail.com

[†]École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne and Central European University, Budapest. (Corresponding) E-mail: abhishekmethuku@gmail.com

Recently, Füredi and Özkahya [7] gave a simpler proof showing a slightly weaker upper bound of $\sqrt{3}n^{3/2} + O(n)$. Alon and Shikhelman [1] improved these results by showing that

$$ex(n, K_3, C_5) \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} n^{3/2}. \quad (2)$$

Ergemlidze, Györi, Methuku and Salia [6] recently showed that

$$ex(n, K_3, C_5) \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} n^{3/2}. \quad (3)$$

In this paper our aim is to introduce a new approach and use it to improve two old results and prove a new one. Our approach consists of carefully counting paths of length 5 (or paths of length 3) by making use of the structure of certain subgraphs. Roughly speaking, we are able to efficiently bound the number of 5-paths if its middle edge lies in a dense subgraph (for e.g., in a K_4). We expect this approach to have further applications.

Our first result improves the previous estimates (1), (2), (3), on the maximum possible number of triangles in a C_5 -free graph, as follows.

Theorem 1. *We have,*

$$ex(n, K_3, C_5) < (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}} n^{3/2}.$$

Given a hypergraph H , its *2-shadow* is the graph consisting of the edges $\{ab \mid ab \subset e \in E(H)\}$. Applying our approach to the 2-shadow of a hypergraph of girth 6, we prove the following result.

Theorem 2. *Let H be an r -uniform hypergraph of girth 6. Then*

$$|E(H)| \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{n^{3/2}}{r^{3/2}(r-1)}.$$

Let us mention a related result of Lazebnik and Verstraëte [8] which states the following. If H is an r -uniform hypergraph of girth 5, then

$$|E(H)| \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{n^{3/2}}{r(r-1)}.$$

Note that Theorem 2 shows that if a (Berge) cycle of length 5 is also forbidden, then the above bound can be improved by a factor of \sqrt{r} .

In Section 3.2, we show a close connection between Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, and prove that the estimate in Theorem 1 can be slightly improved using Theorem 2. However, to illustrate the main ideas of the proof of Theorem 1, we decided to state Theorem 1 in a slightly weaker form.

Loh, Tait, Timmons and Zhou [9] introduced the problem of simultaneously forbidding an induced copy of a graph and a (not necessarily induced) copy of another graph. A graph

is called induced- F -free if it does not contain an induced copy of F . They asked the following question: What is the largest size of an induced- C_4 -free and C_5 -free graph on n vertices? They noted that the example showing the lower bound in (1) is in fact induced- C_4 -free and C_5 -free, thus it gives a lower bound of $(1 + o(1))\frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}n^{3/2}$. (If the “induced- C_4 -free” condition is replaced by “ C_4 -free” condition, then Erdős and Simonovits [4] showed that the answer is $(1 + o(1))\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}n^{3/2}$.) This question seems to be difficult to answer. In [5], Győri and the current authors determined (asymptotically) the maximum size of an induced- $K_{s,t}$ -free and C_{2k+1} -free graph on n vertices in all the cases except in the case when $s = t = 2$ and $k = 2$ (which is the above question) but in this case an upper bound of only $n^{3/2}/2$ was proven [5]. Here we show that using our approach one can slightly improve this upper bound.

Theorem 3. *If a graph G is C_5 -free and induced- C_4 -free, then*

$$|E(G)| \leq (1 + o(1))\frac{n^{3/2}}{2^{10}\sqrt{2}}.$$

Structure of the paper: In Section 2, we prove Theorem 1. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 2 and show how it gives a slight improvement in Theorem 1. Finally in Section 4, we prove Theorem 3.

Notation: Given a graph G and a vertex v of G , let $N_1(v)$ and $N_2(v)$ denote the first neighborhood and the second neighborhood of v respectively.

For a vertex v of G , let $d(v)$ be the degree of v . The average degree of a graph G is denoted by $d(G)$, or simply d if it is clear from the context. The maximum degree of a graph G is denoted by $d_{max}(G)$ or simply d_{max} .

A *walk* or *path* usually refers to an unordered one, unless specified otherwise. That is, a walk or path $v_1v_1v_2 \dots v_k$ is considered equivalent to $v_kv_{k-1}v_2 \dots v_1$.

2 Number of triangles in a C_5 -free graph: Proof of Theorem 1

Let G be a C_5 -free graph with maximum possible number of triangles. We may assume that each edge of G is contained in a triangle, because otherwise, we can delete it without changing the number of triangles. Two triangles T, T' are said to be in the same *block* if they either share an edge or if there is a sequence of triangles $T, T_1, T_2, \dots, T_s, T'$ where each triangle of this sequence shares an edge with the previous one (except the first one of course). It is easy to see that all the triangles in G are partitioned uniquely into blocks. Notice that any two blocks of G are edge-disjoint. Below we will characterize the blocks of G .

A block of the form $\{abc_1, abc_2, \dots, abc_k\}$ where $k \geq 1$, is called a *crown-block* (i.e., a collection of triangles containing the same edge) and a block consisting of all triangles contained in the complete graph K_4 is called a K_4 -*block*. See Figure 1.

The following claim was proved in [6]. We repeat its proof for completeness.




Figure 1: An example of a crown-block and a K_4 -block

Claim 1. *Every block of G is either a crown-block or a K_4 -block.*

Proof. If a block contains only one or two triangles, then it is easy to see that it is a crown-block. So we may assume that a block of G contains at least three triangles and let abc_1, abc_2 be some two triangles in it. We claim that if bc_1x or ac_1x is a triangle in G which is different from abc_1 , then $x = c_2$. Indeed, if $x \neq c_2$, then the vertices a, x, c_1, b, c_2 contain a C_5 , a contradiction. Similarly, if bc_2x or ac_2x is a triangle in G which is different from abc_2 , then $x = c_1$.

Therefore, if ac_i or bc_i (for $i = 1, 2$) is contained in two triangles, then abc_1c_2 forms a K_4 . However, then there is no triangle in G which shares an edge with this K_4 and is not contained in it because if there is such a triangle, then it is easy to find a C_5 in G , a contradiction. So in this case, the block is a K_4 -block, and we are done.

So we can assume that whenever abc_1, abc_2 are two triangles then the edges ac_1, bc_1, ac_2, bc_2 are each contained in exactly one triangle. Therefore, any other triangle which shares an edge with either abc_1 or abc_2 must contain ab . Let abc_3 be such a triangle. Then applying the same argument as before for the triangles abc_1, abc_3 one can conclude that the edges ac_3, bc_3 are contained in exactly one triangle and so, any other triangle of G which shares an edge with one of the triangles abc_1, abc_2, abc_3 must contain ab again. So by induction, it is easy to see that all of the triangles in this block must contain ab . Therefore, it is a crown-block, as needed. \square

Edge Decomposition of G : We define a decomposition \mathcal{D} of the edges of G into paths of length 2, triangles and K_4 's, as follows: Since each edge of G belongs to a triangle, and all the triangles of G are partitioned into blocks, it follows that the edges of G are partitioned into blocks as well. Moreover, by Claim 1, edges of G can be decomposed into crown-blocks and K_4 -blocks. We further partition the edges of each crown-block $\{abc_1, abc_2, \dots, abc_k\}$ (for some $k \geq 1$) into the triangle abc_1 and paths ac_ib where $2 \leq i \leq k$. This gives the desired decomposition \mathcal{D} of $E(G)$.

Claim 2. *Let u, v be two non-adjacent vertices of G . Then the number of paths of length 2 between u and v is at most two. Moreover, if uxv and uyv are the paths of length 2 between u and v , then x and y are adjacent.*

Proof. First let us prove the second part of the claim. Since we assumed every edge is contained in a triangle and u and v are not adjacent, there is a vertex $w \neq v$ such that uxw

is a triangle. If $w \neq y$, then $uwxyv$ is a C_5 , a contradiction. So $w = y$, so x and y are adjacent, as desired.

Now suppose that there are 3 distinct vertices x, y, z such that uxv, uyv, uzv are paths of length 2 between u and v . Then x and y are adjacent by the discussion in the previous paragraph. Therefore $uxyvx$ is a C_5 in G , a contradiction, proving the claim. \square

Let $t(v)$ be the number of triangles containing a vertex v and let $t(G) = t = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{t(v)}{n}$. Observe that number of triangles in G is $nt/3$. Our goal is to bound t from above.

First we claim that for any vertex v of G ,

$$t(v) \leq d(v) \leq 2t(v). \quad (4)$$

Indeed, $d(v) \leq 2t(v)$ simply follows by noting that every edge is in a triangle. Now notice that $t(v)$ is equal to the number of edges contained in the first neighborhood of v (denoted by $N_1(v)$). Moreover, there is no path of length three in the subgraph induced by $N_1(v)$ because otherwise there is a C_5 in G . So by Erdős-Gallai theorem, the number of edges contained in $N_1(v)$ is at most $\frac{3-1}{2} |N_1(v)| = d(v)$. Therefore, $t(v) \leq d(v)$.

Note that by adding up (4) for all the vertices $v \in V(G)$ and dividing by n , we get

$$t \leq d \leq 2t. \quad (5)$$

Suppose there is a vertex v of G , such that $t(v) < t/3$. Then we may delete v and all the edges incident to v from G to obtain a graph G' such that $t(G') > 3(nt/3 - t/3)/(n-1) = t(G)$. Then it is easy to see that if the theorem holds for G' , then it holds for G as well. Repeating this procedure, we may assume that for every vertex v of G , $t(v) \geq t/3$. Therefore, by (4), we may assume that the degree of every vertex of G is at least $t/3$.

Claim 3. *We may assume that $d_{max}(G) \leq 6\sqrt{3}\sqrt{n}$.*

Proof. Suppose that there is a vertex v such that $d(v) > 6\sqrt{3}\sqrt{n}$. The sum of degrees of the vertices in $N_1(v)$ is at least $\frac{|N_1(v)|t}{3} = \frac{d(v)t}{3}$ as we assumed that the degree of every vertex is at least $t/3$. The number of edges inside $N_1(v)$ is $t(v)$, which is at most $d(v)$ by (4). Therefore the number of edges between $N_1(v)$ and $N_2(v)$ is at least $\frac{d(v)t}{3} - 2d(v)$. Now notice that any vertex in $N_2(v)$ is incident to at most two of these edges by Claim 2. Therefore, $|N_2(v)| \geq \frac{d(v)t}{6} - d(v)$.

Thus we have,

$$n \geq |N_1(v)| + |N_2(v)| \geq d(v) + \frac{d(v)t}{6} - d(v) = \frac{d(v)t}{6} > \frac{6\sqrt{3}\sqrt{nt}}{6},$$

which implies $t < \sqrt{\frac{n}{3}}$. Therefore, the total number of triangles in G is less than $\frac{n^{3/2}}{3\sqrt{3}}$, proving Theorem 1. \square

By the Blakley-Roy inequality, the number of (unordered) walks of length five in G is $nd^5/2$. First let us show that most of these walks are paths. Let $v_0v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5$ be a walk that

is not a path. Then $v_i = v_j$ for some $i < j$. Fix some $i < j$. Then there are n choices for v_0 , and then at most d_{max} choices for every v_k with $k \leq j - 1$, then since $v_j = v_i$, there is only choice for v_j and again at most d_{max} choices for every v_k with $k \geq j + 1$. So in total the number of walks that are not paths is at most $\binom{6}{2}n(d_{max})^4$ as there are $\binom{6}{2} = 15$ choices for i, j . Thus the number of (unordered) paths of length five in G is at least $nd^5/2 - 15n(d_{max})^4$. From now, we refer to a path of length five as a 5-path.

We say a 5-path $v_0v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5$ is *bad* if there exists an i such that $v_iv_{i+1}v_{i+2}$ is a triangle of G ; otherwise it called *good*. Our aim is to show that the number of bad 5-paths is very small. Let $v_0v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5$ be a bad 5-path. Then there is an i so that $v_iv_{i+1}v_{i+2}$ is a triangle. If we fix an i , there are at most $2nt$ choices for $v_iv_{i+1}v_{i+2}$ as each of the $nt/3$ triangles can be ordered in $3! = 6$ ways, and there are at most d_{max} choices for every vertex v_k with $k < i$ or $k > i + 2$. There are four choices for i . Therefore, the total number of 5-paths that are bad is at most $8nt(d_{max})^3$. This means that the number of good 5-paths is at least $nd^5/2 - 15n(d_{max})^4 - 8nt(d_{max})^3$. By (1), the number of triangles of G is at most $(1 + o(1))\frac{5n^{3/2}}{4}$. Since the number of triangles of G is $nt/3$, we have $t \leq \frac{15}{4}(1 + o(1))n^{1/2}$. Now using Claim 3, it follows that the number of good 5-paths is at least

$$\frac{nd^5}{2} - 15n(6\sqrt{3}\sqrt{n})^4 - 8n\frac{15}{4}n^{1/2}(6\sqrt{3}\sqrt{n})^3 \geq \frac{nd^5}{2} - Cn^3, \quad (6)$$

where C is some positive constant.

Now we seek to bound the number of good 5-paths from above. Recall that we defined a decomposition \mathcal{D} of the edges of G into three types of subgraphs: paths of length 2, triangles and K_4 's. We distinguish three cases depending on which type of subgraph the middle edge of a good 5-path belongs to, and bound the number of good 5-paths in each of those cases separately in the following three claims.

A path of length two (or a 2-path) xyz is called *good* if x and z are not adjacent.

Claim 4. *Let abc be a 2-path of the edge-decomposition \mathcal{D} . Then the number of good 5-paths in G whose middle edge is either ab or bc is at most n^2 .*

Proof. A good 5-path $xypqzw$ whose middle edge is ab or bc contains good 2-paths, xyp, qzw as subpaths (where pq is either ab or bc). Moreover, since $xypqzw$ is a good 5-path and the 2-path abc is contained in the triangle abc (because of the way we defined the decomposition \mathcal{D}), it follows that $x, y \notin \{a, b, c\}$ and $z, w \notin \{a, b, c\}$.

Let n_a be the number of good 2-paths in G of the form axy where $x, y \notin \{a, b, c\}$, and let n_b be the number of good 2-paths in G of the form bxy where $x, y \notin \{a, b, c\}$. We define n_c similarly. Then the number of good 5-paths whose middle edge is either ab or bc is at most

$$n_a n_b + n_b n_c = n_b(n_a + n_c) \leq \left(\frac{n_a + n_b + n_c}{2}\right)^2.$$

We claim that for any fixed vertex $y \notin \{a, b, c\}$, there are at most two good 2-paths of the form pxy with $p \in \{a, b, c\}$ and $x \notin \{a, b, c\}$. If this claim is true, then $n_a + n_b + n_c \leq 2n$, so the right-hand-side of the above inequality is at most n^2 , proving Claim 4.

It remains to prove this claim. Suppose for a contradiction that there are three such good 2-paths, say, $p_1x_1y, p_2x_2y, p_3x_3y$. Notice that if p_ix_i is disjoint from p_jx_j for some $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then $p_ip_jx_jyx_i$ forms a C_5 in G , a contradiction (note that here we used that p_i and p_j are adjacent even when $\{p_i, p_j\} = \{a, c\}$ because of the way we defined \mathcal{D}). Thus the edges p_1x_1, p_2x_2, p_3x_3 pair-wise intersect, which implies that either $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = p$ or $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = x$ (since $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in \{a, b, c\}$ and $x_1, x_2, x_3 \notin \{a, b, c\}$). The former case is impossible by Claim 2 and in the latter case, note that a, b, c, x forms a K_4 , but this contradicts the definition of \mathcal{D} since abc was assumed to be a 2-path component of \mathcal{D} and no 2-path of \mathcal{D} comes from a K_4 -block of G . \square

Claim 5. *Let abc be a triangle of the edge-decomposition \mathcal{D} . Then the number of good 5-paths in G whose middle edge is either ab, bc, ca is at most $\frac{4n^2}{3}$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of the proof of Claim 4. A good 5-path $xypqzw$ whose middle edge is ab, bc, ca contains good 2-paths, xyp, qzw as subpaths. Moreover, since $xypqzw$ is a good 5-path, it follows that $x, y \notin \{a, b, c\}$ and $z, w \notin \{a, b, c\}$.

Let n_a be the number of good 2-paths in G of the form axy where $x, y \notin \{a, b, c\}$, and let n_b, n_c be defined similarly. Then the number of good 5-paths whose middle edge is ab, bc or ca is at most

$$n_a n_b + n_b n_c + n_c n_a \leq \frac{(n_a + n_b + n_c)^2}{3}.$$

By the same argument as in the proof of Claim 4, it is easy to see that $n_a + n_b + n_c \leq 2n$, so the above inequality finishes the proof. \square

Claim 6. *Let $abcd$ be a K_4 of the edge-decomposition \mathcal{D} . Then the number of good 5-paths in G whose middle edge belongs to the K_4 is at most $\frac{3n^2}{2}$.*

Proof. Notice that any good 5-path $xypqzw$ contains good 2-paths, xyp, qzw as subpaths. Suppose the middle edge of $xypqzw$ belongs to the $K_4, abcd$. Then since $xypqzw$ is a good 5-path, it follows that $x, y \notin \{a, b, c, d\}$ and $z, w \notin \{a, b, c, d\}$.

Let n_a be the number of good 2-paths in G of the form axy where $x, y \notin \{a, b, c, d\}$, and let n_b, n_c, n_d be defined similarly. Then the number of good 5-paths whose middle edge belongs to the $K_4, abcd$ is at most

$$\sum_{i, j \in \{a, b, c, d\}} n_i n_j \leq \frac{3}{8} (n_a + n_b + n_c + n_d)^2. \quad (7)$$

To see that the above inequality is true one simply needs to expand and rearrange the inequality $\sum_{i, j \in \{a, b, c, d\}} (n_i - n_j)^2 \geq 0$.

Using a similar argument as in the proof of Claim 4, it is easy to see that for any fixed vertex $y \notin \{a, b, c, d\}$, there are at most two good 2-paths of the form pxy with $p \in \{a, b, c, d\}$ and $x \notin \{a, b, c, d\}$. This implies that $n_a + n_b + n_c + n_d \leq 2n$, so using (7), the proof is complete. \square

Now we are ready to bound the number of good 5-paths in G from above. Suppose the number of edges of G is $e(G)$, and let $\alpha_1 e(G)$ and $\alpha_2 e(G)$ be the number of edges of G that are contained in triangles and 2-paths of the edge-decomposition \mathcal{D} of G , respectively. Let $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha$. In other words, $(1 - \alpha)e(G)$ edges of G belong to the K_4 's in \mathcal{D} . Then the number of triangles and 2-paths in \mathcal{D} is at most $\frac{\alpha_1}{3}e(G)$ and $\frac{\alpha_2}{2}e(G)$ respectively and the number of K_4 's in \mathcal{D} is at most $\frac{(1-\alpha)}{6}e(G)$. Therefore, using Claim 4, Claim 5 and Claim 6, the total number of good 5-paths in G is at most

$$\frac{\alpha_1}{3}e(G)\frac{4n^2}{3} + \frac{\alpha_2}{2}e(G)n^2 + \frac{(1-\alpha)}{6}e(G)\frac{3n^2}{2} \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}e(G)n^2 + \frac{(1-\alpha)}{4}e(G)n^2 = \frac{(1+\alpha)}{8}n^3d.$$

Combining this with the fact that the number of good 5-paths is at least $nd^5/2 - Cn^3$ (by (6)), we get

$$\frac{nd^5}{2} - Cn^3 \leq \frac{(1+\alpha)}{8}n^3d,$$

which simplifies to $\frac{d^5}{2} \leq \frac{(1+\alpha)}{8}n^2d + Cn^2 = (1 + o(1))\frac{(1+\alpha)}{8}n^2d$. Here we used that $d \geq t = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$ (by (5)). Therefore,

$$d \leq (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{4} \right)^{1/4} \sqrt{n}. \quad (8)$$

Recall that when defining \mathcal{D} we decomposed the edges of each crown-block into a triangle and 2-paths. This means that the number of triangles of G that belong to crown-blocks of G is at most $\frac{\alpha_1 e(G)}{3} + \frac{\alpha_2 e(G)}{2} \leq \frac{\alpha e(G)}{2}$, and the number of triangles that belong to K_4 -blocks of G is at most $\frac{4(1-\alpha)e(G)}{6}$. Therefore, the total number of triangles in G is at most

$$\frac{\alpha e(G)}{2} + \frac{4(1-\alpha)e(G)}{6} = \frac{4-\alpha}{6}e(G) = \frac{(4-\alpha)nd}{12}. \quad (9)$$

Now using (8), we obtain that the number of triangles in G is at most

$$(1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{4} \right)^{1/4} \frac{(4-\alpha)}{12} n^{3/2}.$$

Now optimizing the coefficient of $n^{3/2}$ over $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, one obtains that it is maximized at $\alpha = 0$, giving the desired upper bound of $(1 + o(1))\frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}n^{3/2}$.

3 On hypergraphs of girth 6 and further improvement

In this section we will first study r -uniform hypergraphs of girth 6, and prove Theorem 2. Then we use Theorem 2 to further (slightly) improve the estimate in Theorem 1 on the number of triangles in a C_5 -free graph.

3.1 Girth 6 hypergraphs: Proof of Theorem 2

Let d be the average degree of H . Our aim is to show that $d \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{r(r-1)}}$. If a vertex has degree less than d/r , then we may delete it and the edges incident to it without decreasing the average degree. So we may assume that the minimum degree of H , $\delta(H) \geq d/r$.

Suppose there is a vertex v of degree $c\sqrt{n}$ for some constant c . Then the first neighborhood $N_1^H(v) := \{x \in V(H) \setminus \{v\} \mid v, x \in h \text{ for some } h \in E(H)\}$ has size more than $c\sqrt{n}(r-1)$ (since H is linear), and the second neighborhood $N_2^H(v) = \{x \in V(H) \setminus (N_1^H(v) \cup \{v\}) \mid \exists h \in E(H) \text{ such that } x \in h \text{ and } h \cap N_1^H(v) \neq \emptyset\}$ has size more than

$$c\sqrt{n}(r-1) \times \delta(H)(r-1) \geq c\sqrt{n}(r-1) \times \frac{d(r-1)}{r} = \frac{c\sqrt{n}(r-1)^2 d}{r}.$$

Note that here we used that H has no cycles of length at most four. On the other hand, since $|N_2^H(v)| \leq n$, we have $\frac{c\sqrt{n}(r-1)^2 d}{r} \leq n$, implying that $d \leq \frac{r}{(r-1)^2 c} \sqrt{n}$. So if $c > \frac{r^{3/2}}{r-1}$, we have the desired bound on d . Thus, we may assume $c \leq \frac{r^{3/2}}{r-1}$, which proves that the maximum degree of H , $d_{max} \leq \frac{r^{3/2}}{r-1} \sqrt{n}$.

Let ∂H denote the 2-shadow graph of H . Let $d^{\partial H}$ and $d_{max}^{\partial H}$ denote the average degree and maximum degree of ∂H , respectively. Note that since H is linear, $d^{\partial H} = (r-1)d$ and $d_{max}^{\partial H} = (r-1)d_{max} \leq r^{3/2} \sqrt{n}$.

We say a 3-path $v_0 v_1 v_2 v_3$ in ∂H is *bad* if either $\{v_0, v_1, v_2\} \subseteq h$ or $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\} \subseteq h$ for some hyperedge $h \in E(H)$; otherwise it is *good*.

By the Blakley-Roy inequality the total number of (ordered) 3-walks in ∂H is at least $n(d^{\partial H})^3$. We claim that at most $3n(d_{max}^{\partial H})^2$ of these 3-walks are not 3-paths. Indeed, suppose $v_0 v_1 v_2 v_3$ is a 3-walk that is not a 3-path. Then there exists a repeated vertex v in the walk such that either $v_0 = v_2 = v$ or $v_1 = v_3 = v$ or $v_0 = v_3 = v$. Since v can be chosen in n ways and the other two vertices of the walk are adjacent to v , we can choose them in at most $(d_{max}^{\partial H})^2$ different ways. Therefore, the number of (ordered) 3-paths in ∂H is at least $n(d^{\partial H})^3 - 3n(d_{max}^{\partial H})^2 \geq n(d^{\partial H})^3 - 3n(r^{3/2} \sqrt{n})^2 = n(d^{\partial H})^3 - 3r^3 n^2$.

We will show that most of these 3-paths are good by bounding the number of bad 3-paths. Suppose $v_0 v_1 v_2 v_3$ is a bad 3-path. Then either $\{v_0, v_1, v_2\}$ or $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ is contained in some hyperedge $h \in E(H)$. In the first case, the number of choices for $v_0 v_1 v_2$ is $|E(H)| \binom{r}{3} 3!$ as there are $\binom{r}{3}$ ways to choose the vertices v_0, v_1, v_2 from a hyperedge of H and then $3!$ ways to order them. And there are at most $d_{max}^{\partial H}$ choices for v_3 . The second case is similar. Therefore, in total, the number of bad 3-paths in ∂H is at most $2|E(H)| \binom{r}{3} 3! d_{max}^{\partial H} < 2 \frac{nd}{r} r^3 d_{max}^{\partial H} \leq 2nr^2 d_{max} d_{max}^{\partial H} \leq 2 \frac{r^5}{r-1} n^2$. So the number of (ordered) good 3-paths in ∂H is at least

$$n(d^{\partial H})^3 - 3r^3 n^2 - 2 \frac{r^5}{r-1} n^2 = n(d^{\partial H})^3 - c_r n^2 = (r-1)^3 d^3 n - c_r n^2, \quad (10)$$

where $c_r = 3r^3 + \frac{2r^5}{r-1}$.

The following claim is useful for upper bounding the number of (ordered) good 3-paths in ∂H .

Claim 7. *If C is a cycle of length at most five in ∂H , then its vertex set is contained in some hyperedge of H .*

Proof. Let $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k, v_1$ be a cycle of length k in ∂H (for some $k \leq 5$). For each i , let h_i be the hyperedge of H containing v_i, v_{i+1} (addition in the subscripts is taken modulo k). If these k hyperedges are not all the same, there exists j, j' such that $h_j, h_{j+1}, \dots, h_{j'}$ are all distinct but $h_{j'+1} = h_j$. So these hyperedges form a cycle in H of length at most $k \leq 5$, a contradiction. Therefore, $h_1 = h_2 = \dots = h_k = h$; then $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k \in h$, as desired. \square

In order to upper bound the number of (ordered) good 3-paths in ∂H , let us first fix a hyperedge h of H , and bound the number of good 3-paths $v_0v_1v_2v_3$ such that $v_0, v_1 \in h$.

Claim 8. *For any vertex $v \notin h$, there are at most $(r - 1)$ good 3-paths $v_0v_1v_2v$ such that $v_0, v_1 \in h$.*

Proof. Suppose $v_0v_1v_2v$ and $v'_0v'_1v'_2v$ are good 3-paths with $v_0, v_1, v'_0, v'_1 \in h$. Then $v_2, v'_2 \notin h$ because it would contradict the definition of a good 3-path. We will prove that $v_1 = v'_1$ and $v_2 = v'_2$.

Suppose $v_1 \neq v'_1$. Then depending on whether $v_2 = v'_2$ or not, either $v_1v'_1v'_2vv_2$ forms a five-cycle or $v_1v'_1v'_2$ forms a triangle in ∂H . Then by Claim 7, $v_1, v'_1, v'_2 \in h'$ for some hyperedge $h' \in E(H)$. (Note that $h' \neq h$, since $v'_2 \notin h$.) But then h and h' are two different hyperedges of H that share at least two vertices, namely v_1, v'_1 , contradicting the fact that H is linear. Thus $v_1 = v'_1$.

Now if $v_2 \neq v'_2$, then $vv_2v_1v'_2$ is a four-cycle in ∂H , so it must be contained in a hyperedge of H , but this means the 3-path $v_0v_1v_2v$ is bad, a contradiction. Thus $v_2 = v'_2$.

In summary, any two good 3-paths $v_0v_1v_2v$ and $v'_0v'_1v'_2v$ with $v_0, v_1, v'_0, v'_1 \in h$ can only differ in their first vertex, of which there are at most $r - 1$ choices, proving the claim. \square

Claim 8 implies that for any fixed hyperedge $h \in E(H)$, there are at most $(r - 1)n$ good 3-paths $v_0v_1v_2v_3$ with $v_0, v_1 \in h$. Therefore, the total number of good 3-paths in H is at most $|E(H)|(r - 1)n = \frac{(r-1)dn^2}{r}$.

Combining this with (10), we obtain $(r - 1)^3d^3n - c_r n^2 \leq \frac{(r-1)dn^2}{r}$. Dividing through by d and using that $d = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$, we get $(r - 1)^3d^2n \leq (1 + o(1))\frac{(r-1)n^2}{r}$ and upon simplification and rearranging, we get

$$d \leq (1 + o(1))\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{r}(r - 1)},$$

so using $|E(H)| = nd/r$, completes the proof.

3.2 Further improving the estimate on $ex(n, K_3, C_5)$

Here we slightly improve Theorem 1, by establishing a connection to girth 6 hypergraphs and using Theorem 2.

Recall that in the proof of Theorem 1, G denotes a C_5 -free graph, and $(1 - \alpha)e(G)$ edges of G belong to the K_4 's in the edge-decomposition \mathcal{D} of G . Let us note that the vertex sets of

two different K_4 's of G do not share more than one vertex, since G is C_5 -free. Consider the 4-uniform hypergraph H formed by taking the vertex sets of all the K_4 's of G . Then notice that H is linear and if H contains a (Berge) cycle of length at most 5, then G contains a C_5 . Therefore, H is of girth 6. Therefore, by Theorem 2, H contains at most $n^{3/2}/24$ hyperedges. Thus at most $n^{3/2}/24 \times \binom{4}{2} = n^{3/2}/4$ edges of G belong to the K_4 's in the edge-decomposition \mathcal{D} . Therefore, $(1 - \alpha)e(G) \leq \frac{n^{3/2}}{4}$, which implies $d \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2(1-\alpha)}$. Combining this with (8), we get

$$d \leq (1 + o(1)) \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)}, \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{4} \right)^{1/4} \right\} \sqrt{n},$$

so using (9), we obtain that the number of triangles in G is at most

$$(1 + o(1)) \frac{(4-\alpha)}{12} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)}, \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{4} \right)^{1/4} \right\} n^{3/2}.$$

The above function is maximized at $\alpha = 0.343171$, proving that $ex(n, K_3, C_5) \leq 0.231975n^{3/2}$.

4 C_5 -free and induced- C_4 -free graphs: Proof of Theorem 3

Let G be a C_5 -free graph on n vertices having no induced copies of C_4 . Let G_Δ be the subgraph of G consisting of the edges that are contained in triangles of G , and let G_S be the subgraph of G consisting of the remaining edges of G . Since G_Δ is C_5 -free and every edge of it is contained in a triangle, by the same argument of the proof of Theorem 1, the triangles of G_Δ can be partitioned into crown-blocks and K_4 -blocks. So there is a decomposition \mathcal{D} of the edges of G_Δ into paths of length 2, triangles and K_4 's. First let us note that Claim 2 in the proof of Theorem 1 still holds for G (not just for G_Δ), as shown below.

Claim 9. *Let u, v be two non-adjacent vertices of G . Then the number of paths of length 2 between u and v is at most two. Moreover, if uxv and uyv are the paths of length 2 between u and v , then x and y are adjacent.*

Proof. The second part of the claim is trivial since G does not contain an induced copy of C_4 . To see the first part of the claim, suppose uxv, uyv, uzv are three distinct paths of length 2 in G . Then x and y are adjacent, so $uxyvz$ is a C_5 in G , a contradiction. \square

Our goal is to bound the average degree d of G . If a vertex has degree less than $d/2$, then it may be deleted without decreasing the average degree of G , so we may assume that G has minimum degree at least $d/2$. Now using this fact and Claim 9, one can show that the maximum degree of G is at most $10\sqrt{n}$ by repeating the same argument as in the proof of Claim 3.

We say a 5-path $v_0v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5$ is *bad* if there exists an i such that $v_i v_{i+1} v_{i+2}$ is a triangle of G ; otherwise it called *good*. Similarly, a 2-path abc is *good* if a and c are not adjacent. By

the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1, the number of (unordered) good 5-paths in G is at least

$$\frac{nd^5}{2} - Cn^3 \quad (11)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Now we bound the number of good 5-paths in G from above. Let $|E(G_\Delta)| = \alpha |E(G)|$ for some $\alpha \geq 0$, so $|E(G_S)| = (1 - \alpha) |E(G)|$.

Claim 10. *The number of good 5-paths in G whose middle edge is contained in G_S is at most $|E(G_S)| n^2$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of the proof of Claim 4. A good 5-path $xyabzw$ whose middle edge ab is in G_S contains good 2-paths, xya, bzx as subpaths.

Let n_a be the number of good 2-paths in G of the form axy where $x, y \neq b$, and let n_b be the number of good 2-paths in G of the form bxy where $x, y \neq a$. Then the number of good 5-paths whose middle edge is ab is at most $n_a n_b \leq (n_a + n_b)^2 / 4$. By the same argument as in the proof of Claim 4, it is easy to see that $n_a + n_b \leq 2n$, so the number of good 5-paths whose middle edge is $ab \in E(G_S)$ is at most n^2 . Adding these estimates for all the edges $ab \in E(G_S)$ finishes the proof of the claim. \square

Let us further assume that the number of edges of G_Δ that belong to paths of length 2, triangles and K_4 's in its edge-decomposition \mathcal{D} be $\alpha_1 |E(G)|, \alpha_2 |E(G)|, \alpha_3 |E(G)|$, respectively. (Of course, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = \alpha$.) Since Claim 9 holds, one can easily check that the proofs of Claim 4, Claim 5 and Claim 6 are still valid, so these claims hold in the current setting too. These claims, together with Claim 10, imply that the number of good 5-paths in G is at most

$$\frac{\alpha_1 |E(G)|}{2} n^2 + \frac{\alpha_2 |E(G)|}{3} \frac{4n^2}{3} + \frac{\alpha_3 |E(G)|}{6} \frac{3n^2}{2} + |E(G_S)| n^2 \leq \frac{\alpha |E(G)|}{2} n^2 + (1 - \alpha) |E(G)| n^2.$$

We will now bound the right-hand-side of the above inequality by carefully selecting a C_5 -free, and C_4 -free subgraph G' of G , as follows: We select all the edges of G_S and the following edges from G_Δ : From each crown-block $\{abc_1, abc_2, \dots, abc_k\}$ of G_Δ , we select the edges ac_1, ac_2, \dots, ac_k to be in G' . From each K_4 -block $abcd$ we select the edges ab, bc, ac, ad to be in G' .

To show that G' is C_4 -free we use the following claim.

Claim 11. *All four edges of any C_4 in G belong to only one block of G_Δ .*

Proof. Let $xyzw$ be a 4-cycle in G . Then since G does not contain an induced copy of C_4 , either xz or yw is an edge of G . In the first case, xzy, xzw are triangles of G , and in the second case ywz, ywx are triangles of G . In both cases, the two triangles share an edge, so they belong to the same block of G_Δ . Hence, all four edges of $xyzw$ lie in the same block of G_Δ . \square

By Claim 11, the edge set of every C_4 is completely contained in some block of G_Δ , and it is easy to check that the selected edges in each block of G_Δ form a C_4 -free graph. Therefore,

G' is C_4 -free. Since it is a subgraph of G , it is also C_5 -free. Therefore, by a theorem of Erdős and Simonovits [4], $|E(G')| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}n^{3/2}$. On the other hand, since all the edges of G_S and at least half the edges of G_Δ are selected, we have $|E(G')| \geq |E(G_S)| + \frac{|E(G_\Delta)|}{2} = (1 - \alpha)|E(G)| + \frac{\alpha|E(G)|}{2}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\alpha|E(G)|}{2} + (1 - \alpha)|E(G)| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}n^{3/2}.$$

Therefore, by the discussion above, the number of good 5-paths in G is at most $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}n^{3/2} \times n^2 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}n^{7/2}$. Combining this with (11), we get

$$\frac{nd^5}{2} - Cn^3 \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}n^{7/2},$$

so $\frac{nd^5}{2} \leq (1 + o(1))\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}n^{7/2}$, implying that $d \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt[10]{2}}$, finishing the proof.

Acknowledgements

The research of the authors is partially supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office – NKFIH, grant K116769.

References

- [1] N. Alon and C. Shikhelman, Many T copies in H -free graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **121** (2016) 146–172.
- [2] B. Bollobás and E. Győri, Pentagons vs. triangles. *Discrete Mathematics* **308.19** (2008) 4332–4336.
- [3] P. Erdős, On some problems in graph theory, combinatorial analysis and combinatorial number theory. B. Bollobas (Ed.), *Graph Theory and Combinatorics* (Cambridge, 1983), Academic Press, London (1984) 1–17.
- [4] P. Erdős and M. Simonovits, Compactness results in extremal graph theory. *Combinatorica* **2.3** (1982) 275–288.
- [5] B. Ergemlidze, E. Győri and A. Methuku. Turán number of an induced complete bipartite graph plus an odd cycle. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, (2018) 1–12.
- [6] B. Ergemlidze, E. Győri, A. Methuku and N. Salia. A note on the maximum number of triangles in a C_5 -free graph. *Journal of Graph Theory*, (2018) 1–4, In print.
- [7] Z. Füredi and L. Özkahya. On 3-uniform hypergraphs without a cycle of a given length. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **216**, (2017) 582–588.

- [8] F. Lazebnik and J. Verstraëte. On hypergraphs of girth five. *Electron. J. Combin* 10 (2003) R25.
- [9] P. Loh, M. Tait, C. Timmons and R.M. Zhou. Induced Turán numbers. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, **27(2)** (2017) 274–288.