

Graphs without rainbow triangles

by P. Frankl

Rényi Institute, Budapest, Hungary*

Abstract

Let $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \dots, \mathcal{G}_t$ be graphs on the same n vertices. Assuming that there is no way to choose three edges from distinct \mathcal{G}_i that form a triangle we determine the maximum of $|\mathcal{G}_1| + \dots + |\mathcal{G}_t|$. Under the same conditions and $t = 3$ we conjecture that $|\mathcal{G}_1||\mathcal{G}_2||\mathcal{G}_3| \leq (n^2/4)^3$ holds. This inequality is proved under some additional conditions.

1 Introduction

Let (V, \mathcal{E}) be a graph with vertex-set V and edge-set $\mathcal{E} \subset \binom{V}{2}$. When it causes no confusion we shall omit V . Let us use the notation $\mathcal{E}(x) = \{y \in V : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ (the neighbourhood of x) and $\mathcal{E}(\bar{x}) = \{E \in \mathcal{E} : x \notin E\}$, the subgraph spanned by $V \setminus \{x\}$. Note the obvious relation $|\mathcal{E}| = |\mathcal{E}(x)| + |\mathcal{E}(\bar{x})|$.

A *triangle* is the complete graph on three vertices, $(T, \binom{T}{2})$: $T \in \binom{V}{3}$. A *matching* is a collection $\mathcal{M} = \{E_1, \dots, E_\ell\}$ of pairwise disjoint edges and ℓ is its *size*. The maximum size of a matching in \mathcal{E} is denoted by $\nu(\mathcal{E})$, it is called the *matching number*.

For a fixed graph \mathcal{G} , (V, \mathcal{E}) is called \mathcal{G} -free if it contains no subgraph isomorphic to \mathcal{G} .

Definition 1.1. For a positive integer n and a fixed graph \mathcal{G} let $m(n, \mathcal{G})$ denote the maximum of $|\mathcal{E}|$ where (V, \mathcal{E}) is \mathcal{G} -free and $|V| = n$.

*The research was supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office NKFIH, Hungary, grant number K132696.

The first such result was due to Mantel (1907), cf. [B] or [L]. It states that

$$(1.1) \quad m(n, \text{triangle}) = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor.$$

This simple result went unnoticed and the now burgeoning field of *extremal graph theory* came to existence only after Turán [T] determined $\text{ex}(n, K_r)$ where K_r is the complete graph on r vertices.

We'll need Mantel's theorem in the following stronger form.

Proposition 1.2. *Let n, ℓ be positive integers, $n \geq 2\ell$ and (V, \mathcal{E}) a triangle-free graph with $|V| = n$, $\nu(\mathcal{E}) = \ell$. Then*

$$(1.2) \quad |\mathcal{E}| \leq \ell(n - \ell).$$

Moreover there exists a partition $V = X \sqcup Y \sqcup Z$, $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_\ell\}$, $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_\ell\}$ with the following properties

- (i) $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{E}$, $1 \leq i \leq \ell$.
- (ii) For every $z \in Z$, $\mathcal{E}(z) \subset X$.

Note that (1.2) follows from (i) and (ii). Indeed, if w, x_i, y_i are three distinct elements of $X \cup Y$, then the absence of triangles implies that w is connected to at most one of the two vertices x_i and y_i . Consequently, the degree of (the arbitrary vertex) w in $X \cup Y$ is at most ℓ . Thus \mathcal{E} restricted to $X \cup Y$ has at most $2\ell \times \ell/2 = \ell^2$ edges.

In view of (ii) the number of edges adjacent to Z is at most $|Z|\ell = (n - 2\ell)\ell$. Thus $|\mathcal{E}| \leq \ell^2 + (n - 2\ell)\ell = (n - \ell)\ell$.

Proof of (i) and (ii). Let (v_i, w_i) , $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ be a matching of size ℓ in \mathcal{E} and set $W = \{v_1, w_1, \dots, v_\ell, w_\ell\}$, $Z = V \setminus W$. The maximality of the matching implies that $\mathcal{E} \cap \binom{Z}{2} = \emptyset$. If there is an edge $(z, x_i) \in \mathcal{E}$ with $z \in Z$ and $x_i \in (v_i, w_i)$, then we put x_i into X and let the other vertex of (v_i, w_i) be y_i . The important observation is that $(z, y_i) \notin \mathcal{E}$ (it would finish a triangle) and $(z', y_i) \notin \mathcal{E}$ for $z' \in Z$, $z' \neq z$ as replacing (x_i, y_i) by (x_i, z) and (y_i, z') would produce a larger matching. If there is no edge connecting Z and (v_i, w_i) , then we put arbitrarily one vertex into X and the other into Y . It should be clear that $V = X \sqcup Y \sqcup Z$ is a partition with properties (i) and (ii). \square

Recently so-called *rainbow* structures have received quite some attention. Confer the excellent survey article by Fujita, Magnant and Ozeki [FMO].

Definition 1.3. Let $\mathcal{E}_i \subset \binom{V}{2}$, $1 \leq i \leq t$ and let \mathcal{G} be a fixed graph, $s = |\mathcal{G}|$. If for some choice of $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_s \leq t$ and edges $E_{i_j} \in \mathcal{E}_{i_j}$ the graph $\{E_{i_1}, \dots, E_{i_s}\}$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{G} , then it is called a rainbow copy of \mathcal{G} . If no such copy exists, $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_t$ are said to be *rainbow \mathcal{G} -free*, or *RBG-free* for short. If $s > t$, then no rainbow copy of \mathcal{G} exists.

Setting T for the triangle our first result is the following

Theorem 1.4.* *Let $t \geq 3$ and suppose that $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_t \subset \binom{V}{2}$, $|V| = n$ are RBT-free. Then (i) or (ii) hold*

(i) $t = 3$ and

$$|\mathcal{G}_1| + |\mathcal{G}_2| + |\mathcal{G}_3| \leq n(n-1),$$

(ii) $t \geq 4$ and

$$(1.3) \quad |\mathcal{G}_1| + \dots + |\mathcal{G}_t| \leq t \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor.$$

Remark. Setting $\mathcal{G}_1 = \dots = \mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{E}$, (1.3) implies Mantel's theorem. Letting $\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{G}_2$ be the complete graph and \mathcal{G}_3 the empty graph (on n vertices) shows that (i) is best possible. For $n \geq 5$ this is the essentially unique way to achieve equality. For $t \geq 4$ letting $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_t$ be the same complete bipartite graph with partite sets of size $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and $\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$ provides the essentially unique example for equality.

We should note that knowing (1.3) for a certain value of t implies (1.3) for $t+1$. Indeed, suppose that (1.3) holds for t , $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{t+1}$ are RBT-free and by symmetry $|\mathcal{G}_1| \geq \dots \geq |\mathcal{G}_t| \geq |\mathcal{G}_{t+1}|$. From (1.3), $|\mathcal{G}_t| \leq n^2/4$ and thereby $|\mathcal{G}_{t+1}| \leq \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$ follow. Thus (1.3) holds for $t+1$ as well.

Consequently we only need to prove (1.3) for $t = 4$. As we will show later, to prove (i) and (ii) it is sufficient to consider *nested families* of graphs, i.e., $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_t$ satisfying $\mathcal{G}_1 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{G}_t$. For such graphs we prove a stronger inequality in the case $t = 3$.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose that $\mathcal{G}_1 \subset \mathcal{G}_2 \subset \mathcal{G}_3 \subset \binom{V}{2}$, $|V| = n$ and $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_3$ are RBT-free. Then*

$$(1.4) \quad |\mathcal{G}_1| |\mathcal{G}_2| |\mathcal{G}_3| \leq \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor^3.$$

Remark. We are going to prove (1.4) under the slightly weaker condition $\mathcal{G}_1 \subset \mathcal{G}_2 \cap \mathcal{G}_3$, i.e., without requiring $\mathcal{G}_2 \subset \mathcal{G}_3$. The proof is short and elementary.

*The referee pointed out that Theorem 1.4 was proved in a more general form in [KSSW]. Our proof is different.

2 The proof of Theorem 1.4

Let (V, \mathcal{E}) be a graph. A subset $S \subset V$ is called a *transversal* or an *edge-cover* if for every $E \in \mathcal{E}$, $S \cap E \neq \emptyset$. The inequality $|S| \geq \nu(\mathcal{E})$ should be obvious. König [K] proved that for bipartite graphs equality holds. Let us state a simple consequence of it.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that \mathcal{B} is a bipartite graph with partite sets X and Y , $|X| = |Y| =: q$ and $\nu(\mathcal{B}) < q$. Then*

$$(2.1) \quad |\mathcal{B}| \leq (q-1)q$$

with equality iff \mathcal{B} is a complete bipartite graph with partite sets of size $q-1$ and q (plus an isolated vertex).

Corollary 2.2. *Suppose that $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_3$ are RBT-free and let $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ be a triangle, i.e., $\mathcal{T} = \binom{Z}{2}$ for some 3-set Z . Then*

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} |\mathcal{G}_i \cap \mathcal{T}| \leq 6.$$

Proof. Construct a bipartite graph \mathcal{F} with partite sets $X = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $Y = \{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ by making (i, T_j) an edge of \mathcal{F} iff $T_j \in \mathcal{G}_i$.

A perfect matching in \mathcal{F} corresponds to a rainbow triangle. Thus (2.2) follows from (2.1). \square

The proof of Theorem 1.4 (i). Adding (2.2) for all $\binom{n}{3}$ subsets $Z \in \binom{V}{3}$ yields

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \sum_{Z \in \binom{V}{3}} |\mathcal{G}_i \cap \mathcal{T}| \leq 6 \binom{n}{3} = n(n-1)(n-2).$$

Since each incidence $T_j \in \mathcal{G}_i$ is counted exactly $n-2$ times (once for every $Z, T_j \subset Z \in \binom{V}{3}$), the LHS equals $(n-2)(|\mathcal{G}_1| + |\mathcal{G}_2| + |\mathcal{G}_3|)$ and (i) follows. \square

In case of equality, equality must hold in (2.2) for *all* $\binom{n}{3}$ choices of Z . Using the uniqueness part of Proposition 2.1 and “continuity” we infer that either for *each* triangle T there are two edges contained in all three graphs $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_3$. Or *each* triangle is contained in exactly two of the graphs $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_3$.

It is straightforward to check that for $n = 5$ (and thus for $n \geq 5$) the first case is impossible. In the second case it easily follows that the triangles must always be in the same two graphs. Consequently $\mathcal{G}_i = \binom{V}{2}$ holds for two of the graphs and the third is empty. \square

Let us next deal with the case $t \geq 4$. We need two simple statements. Let us use the notation $d_{\mathcal{G}}(x, Y)$ to denote the number of edges of the form $(x, y) \in \mathcal{G}$ with $y \in Y$.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{G} \subset \binom{V}{2}$ is triangle-free, $\{E_1, \dots, E_\ell\} \subset \mathcal{G}$ is a matching with $W = E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_\ell$. Then (i) and (ii) hold.*

- (i) $d_{\mathcal{G}}(x, W) \leq \ell$ for all $x \in V \setminus W$.
- (ii) If E_1, \dots, E_ℓ form a maximal matching, then

$$d_{\mathcal{G}}(x, V/\{x\}) \leq \ell \quad \text{for all } x \in V \setminus W.$$

Proof. To prove (i) just note that x being adjacent to both endvertices of E_j would force a triangle.

To prove (ii) notice further that x being adjacent to a vertex $y \notin W$ would force a larger matching. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \binom{V}{2}$ are RBT-free and let $\{E_1, \dots, E_\ell\} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be a matching. Set $W = E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_\ell$ and fix $x \in V/W$. Then*

$$(2.3) \quad d_{\mathcal{C}}(x, W) + d_{\mathcal{D}}(x, W) \leq 2\ell.$$

Proof. For each edge E_j , $1 \leq j \leq \ell$, $E_j \in \mathcal{B}$ because $\{x\} \cup E_j$ is not spanning a rainbow triangle, $d_{\mathcal{C}}(x, E_j) + d_{\mathcal{D}}(x, E_j) \leq 2$.

Summing this inequality for $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ yields (2.3). \square

Definition 2.5. Let us call the graph (V, \mathcal{G}) *nearly matchable* if it possesses a matching of size ℓ with $2\ell \geq n - 2$.

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose that $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \binom{V}{2}$ are RBT-free and \mathcal{B} is nearly matchable. Then*

$$(2.4) \quad |\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}| \leq 2 \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor.$$

Proof. (2.4) holds for $n = 1$ and 2 . Let us prove it for $n \geq 3$ by applying induction on n . Let $\{E_1, \dots, E_\ell\} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be a matching with $2\ell = n - 1$ or $n - 2$. Fix $y \in V \setminus \{E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_\ell\}$. Note that omitting the vertex y , the remaining graph $\mathcal{B}(\overline{y})$ is nearly matchable. By the induction hypothesis

$$(2.5) \quad |\mathcal{C}(\overline{y})| + |\mathcal{D}(\overline{y})| \leq 2 \lfloor (n - 1)^2/4 \rfloor.$$

Set $\mathcal{G}(y) = \{x : \{x, y\} \in \mathcal{G}\}$. Note that in the case $2\ell = n - 1$, $V \setminus \{y\} = E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_\ell$. Thus (2.3) implies $|\mathcal{C}(y)| + |\mathcal{D}(y)| \leq 2\ell = n - 1$. Adding this to (2.5), $|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}| \leq 2\ell^2 + 2\ell = 2(\ell^2 + \ell) = 2 \lfloor (2\ell + 1)^2/4 \rfloor$ follows.

In the case $2\ell = n - 2$, i.e., $2\ell + 1 = n - 1$ there is one more vertex in $V \setminus \{E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_\ell\}$. Thus (2.3) implies $|\mathcal{C}(y)| + |\mathcal{D}(y)| \leq 2\ell + 2$. Adding this to (2.5) yields $|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}| \leq 2 \lfloor (2\ell + 1)^2/4 \rfloor + 2(\ell + 1) = 2(\ell + 1)^2 = 2 \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$, as desired. \square

We shall deduce (1.3) from the following statement.

Theorem 2.7. *Suppose that $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \binom{V}{2}$ are RBT-free and \mathcal{B} is triangle-free. Then*

$$(2.6) \quad 2|\mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}| \leq 4 \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor.$$

Proof. The statement is trivial for $n = 1, 2$. Let us apply induction to prove (2.6). By Mantel's theorem we have:

$$(2.7) \quad |\mathcal{B}| \leq \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor.$$

Now if \mathcal{B} is nearly matchable, then (2.6) follows from (2.7) and (2.4). Thus we may assume that \mathcal{B} is not nearly matchable, $\{E_1, \dots, E_\ell\} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is a maximal matching, $W = E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_\ell$, $2\ell \leq n - 2$. Fix $x \in V \setminus W$. In view of Lemma 2.3 (ii) $2d_{\mathcal{B}}(x) \leq 2\ell$.

On the other hand (2.3) shows that counting with multiplicity there are at least 2ℓ edges of the form (x, w) , $w \in W$ missing from \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} . Consequently,

$$2d_{\mathcal{B}}(x) + d_{\mathcal{C}}(x) + d_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \leq 2\ell + 2(n - 1) - 2\ell = 2(n - 1).$$

By the induction hypothesis,

$$2|\mathcal{B}(\bar{x})| + |\mathcal{C}(\bar{x})| + |\mathcal{D}(\bar{x})| \leq 4 \lfloor (n - 1)^2/4 \rfloor.$$

Thus

$$2|\mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}| \leq 4 \lfloor (n - 1)^2/4 \rfloor + 2(n - 1) \leq 4 \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor. \quad \square$$

Finally let us deduce (1.3) from (2.6). As noted after the statement, it is sufficient to prove (1.3) for $t = 4$.

Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \binom{V}{2}$ be RBT-free.

Observation 2.8. $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$, \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{D} are RBT-free as well and $|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}| = |\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}|$. \square

In view of the observation if $\mathcal{A} \not\subset \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B} \not\subset \mathcal{A}$, then we may replace \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} by $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. Repeating this procedure after renaming the new families $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ in some order, eventually we arrive at $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \binom{V}{2}$ that are RBT-free and nested, that is, satisfy $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{D}$ as well. Now by the RBT-free property \mathcal{B} must be triangle-free. Applying (2.6) we infer $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}| \leq 2|\mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}| \leq 4 \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$ as desired. \square

3 The proof of Theorem 1.5

To avoid double indices let us rename the three families, $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{G}_1$, $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{G}_2$, $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{G}_3$. Since $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ are RBT-free, \mathcal{B} is triangle-free. Set $\ell = \nu(\mathcal{B})$.

If \mathcal{B} is nearly matchable, i.e., $n \leq 2\ell + 2$, then $|\mathcal{B}||\mathcal{C}||\mathcal{D}| \leq \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor^3$ follows from Proposition 2.6.

From now on we assume $n > 2\ell + 2$ and apply Proposition 1.2 to \mathcal{B} . Let $V = X \cup Y \cup Z$ be the corresponding partition and $\{(x_i, y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}$ a maximal matching in \mathcal{B} .

Let p be the maximum degree inside X in the bipartite graph $\mathcal{B} \cap (X \times Z)$. For convenience suppose x_1 has degree p and $(x_1, z_j) : 1 \leq j \leq p$ are the edges from x_1 to Z .

The important thing to note is that being RBT-free implies that for $1 \leq j < j' \leq p$, $(z_j, z_{j'}) \notin \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Indeed, otherwise $\{x_1, z_j, z_{j'}\}$ would span a rainbow triangle (note that we use $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{D}$ but do not need $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{D}$ for this).

Let us provide upper bounds on $|\mathcal{B}|$, $|\mathcal{C}|$ and $|\mathcal{D}|$. Set $q = |Z|$.

Proposition 3.1.

- (i) $|\mathcal{B}| \leq \ell^2 + \ell p$.
- (ii) $\frac{1}{2}(|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}|) \leq \ell^2 + \ell q + \binom{q}{2} - \binom{p}{2} \leq \ell^2 + \ell p + \frac{q^2}{2} - \frac{p^2}{2}$.

Proof. (i) follows from Proposition 1.2 and the definition of p . To prove (ii) note that the RBT-free property implies that for all $1 \leq i < i' \leq \ell$ out of the four edges joining (x_i, y_i) and $(x_{i'}, y_{i'})$, counting with multiplicity, there are at most four in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$. This implies $|\mathcal{C} \cap \binom{X \cup Y}{2}| + |\mathcal{D} \cap \binom{X \cup Y}{2}| \leq 2\ell^2$. Then Lemma 2.4 yields $|\mathcal{C} \cap (X \cup Y) \times Z| + |\mathcal{D} \cap (X \cup Y) \times Z| \leq 2\ell q$. Finally from

the above observation, at least $\binom{p}{2}$ edges are missing from $\binom{Z}{2}$ in both \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} . Thus

$$\left| \mathcal{C} \cap \binom{Z}{2} \right| + \left| \mathcal{D} \cap \binom{Z}{2} \right| \leq 2 \binom{q}{2} - 2 \binom{p}{2} = q^2 - p^2 - (q - p).$$

Summing these inequalities yields (ii). \square

In view of Proposition 3.1 in order to prove Theorem 1.5 we should show

$$(3.1) \quad (\ell^2 + \ell p) \left(\ell^2 + \ell q + \frac{q^2}{2} - \frac{p^2}{2} \right)^2 \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(2\ell + q)^2}{4} \right\rfloor^3.$$

To avoid meticulous calculation we shall only deal in detail with the case q is even, i.e., when we can remove the integer part symbol $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$. However it will be clear from the proof that for $q > 0$ the inequality is always strict and for $q \geq 3$ there is plenty of room left to take care of the difference of $1/4$ for q odd.

For notational purposes define $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta$ by $q = 2\ell\beta$, $p = 2\ell\alpha$. Now (3.1) is equivalent to

$$(1 + 2\alpha)(1 + 2\beta + 2\beta^2 - 2\alpha^2)^2 \leq (1 + \beta)^6.$$

Noting that $(1 + \alpha)^2 \geq 1 + 2\alpha$, it is sufficient to show

$$(3.2) \quad (1 + \alpha)(1 + 2\beta + 2\beta^2 - 2\alpha^2) \leq (1 + \beta)^3.$$

After expanding we get

$$\alpha + (2\alpha\beta - 2\alpha^2) + (2\alpha(\beta - \alpha)(\beta + \alpha)) \leq \beta + \beta^2 + \beta^3.$$

Now, $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $2\alpha\beta - 2\alpha^2 = 2(\beta - \alpha)\alpha < \beta^2/2$ and further $2\alpha(\beta - \alpha)(\beta + \alpha) \leq 2 \cdot \frac{\beta^2}{4} \cdot 2\beta = \beta^3$. Thus (3.2) and thereby the theorem is proved. \square

Let us mention that in fact we proved

$$|\mathcal{B}||\mathcal{C}||\mathcal{D}| \leq \left(\frac{(2\ell + q)^2}{4} \right)^3 \bigg/ \left(\frac{(1 + \alpha)^2}{1 + 2\alpha} \right)^2.$$

Unless α is very-very small the RHS is smaller than the RHS of (3.1) even for q odd. On the other hand if α is small, then (3.1) can be easily proved.

Let us conclude this paper with the obvious conjecture.

Conjecture 3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \binom{V}{2}$, $|V| = n$ and $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ are RBT-free. Then*

$$(3.3) \quad |\mathcal{B}||\mathcal{C}||\mathcal{D}| \leq \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor^3.$$

References

- [B] B. Bollobás, *Extremal graph theory*, Academic Press, London, 1978.
- [FMO] S. Fujita, C. Magnant and K. Ozeki, Rainbow generalizations of Ramsey Theory – A dynamic survey, *Theory and Applications of Graphs*, Vol 0, Issue 1, Article 1.
- [K] D. König, *Theorie der endlichen und unendlichen Graphen*, Leipzig, 1936.
- [KSSW] P. Keevash, M. Saks, B. Sudakov and J. Verstraete, Multicoloured Turan problems, *Advances in Applied Mathematics* **33** (2004), 238–262.
- [L] L. Lovász, *Combinatorial problems and exercises*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979.
- [T] P. Turán, On an extremal problem in graph theory, *Matematikai és Fizikai Lapok* (in Hungarian), **48** (1941), 436–452.